

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

VOL. 1.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—JESUS CHRIST.

NO. 33.

[\$1 50 in advance.]

PROVIDENCE, R. I. SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1825.

[\$2 at the end of the year.]

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

By BARZILLAI CRANSTON,

At No. 8, North Main-Street (3d story) near the
Market-House.

Rev. DAVID PICKERING, Editor.

REV. MR. FISK'S SERMON.

A brief review of the Rev. Mr. Fisk's Sermon, delivered
in Providence, R. I. in June, 1823, before the New-
England Conference.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 126.)

Another assertion which we quoted from page 5. ought not to be passed over in silence, on account of the unhappy effect it would naturally produce, were it believed and reduced to practice in society.— "The sinner is not always the most wretched here, neither is the saint always the most happy." As strangely absurd and erroneous as this declaration must appear to those who have read the scriptures with suitable care and attention, still we behold it stalking from the pulpit in all the pomp of theological assurance, and emblazoned from the press under the sanction of a numerous and respectable clergy. The approbation of these Rev. gentlemen has given to this unscriptural sentiment, especially among those who are not habituated to the investigation of polemical subjects, a currency, which it by no means deserves. What shall we think of that man's religious creed, and of his piety to God, who derives less pleasure and enjoyment from his views of the character of God, and the plan of his grace; and less peace of soul from his acts of devotion, and the obedience which he pays, than the *hardened wretch* does from a career of wickedness? To say the least of his creed, or theory of doctrine, it must be in character, nearly allied to that of Job's comforters—*Miserable indeed!* and of his devotion, that it must be the wild-fire of fanaticism, or the offspring of slavish fear, which is *torment*.

In order to give this egregious error the air of plausibility and the colouring of truth, he invites us to "compare their outward enjoyments;" and quotes St. Paul—"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." By comparing their *outward enjoyments*, I suppose Mr. F. means to infer that wicked men are frequently prosperous in the acquisition of wealth, while piety is as frequently coupled with poverty. But does wealth make the man happy? If so, Solomon must have laboured under a great mistake—for he assures us that "the abundance of the rich will not suffer sleep." Has not Mr. F. here fallen under the censure of Christ? "Ye judge after the flesh." True happiness does not depend on any outward or temporal possessions, but on the state of the mind: It consists not in *uncertain riches*, but in a *peaceful and rec-*

onciled mind. Whether, therefore, in affluence or indigence, the heart that reposes confidence in the wisdom and goodness of God, and by faith in his mercy and grace, is excited to the obedience of love, tastes largely the springs of pure enjoyment, and is, in the only true sense of the word, the happy man. I am astonished at this strange perversion of St. Paul's words by Mr. F. He has evidently quoted them to prove that the wicked are happier in this world than the righteous—"If in this life only," &c. Does the apostle here intimate that the wicked are happier in this life than the righteous? So far from any thing of this kind, that the contrary is clearly inferable from his words—He speaks with the greatest assurance of his hope of a future life, which was built on Christ, and gives the Corinthians to understand that this assurance which he enjoyed of future immortality, was a source of happiness and joy to him, which vastly overbalanced all the evils which he had to endure in the flesh: But without that hope in Christ—stript of all prospects except those which centred in sublunary things—surrounded by enemies, and subjected to bitter persecution, he might well say, "if in this life only, we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." The same may be said of the primitive disciples generally. The profession of christianity subjected them to persecution, among both Jews and Gentiles: and if the gospel presented no rational prospects to them of happiness but in the present state of temporal being, they were in a far more deplorable condition than the unbelieving Jews, or the ignorant and idolatrous Pagans. But when we allow them to have enjoyed the unspeakable consolations arising from the assurance of endless and uninterrupted glory in a future world, the balance of enjoyment was vastly in their favour—And these could doubtless say with the apostle, "we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

In order to establish his favorite position, Mr. Fisk has also quoted a part of the lxxiii. Psalm, where the writer acknowledges himself *envious at the prosperity of the wicked*. The number I trust is very small, who will consider *envy* as a pious exercise of the human heart; especially at this enlightened age: Nor does it appear that the Psalmist himself considered it a virtue, from his subsequent acknowledgment. He doubtless, for the moment, supposed as Mr. Fisk does, that the wicked were much happier in this world than the righteous. But he has the ingenuousness to rectify the error, and that on the same page; while Mr. F. persists in the delusion. The Psalmist saw the wicked prospering, increasing in wealth, and apparently happy; and supposed that they were "not plagued like other men, but had more than heart could wish." He even supposed that he had "cleansed his heart in vain, and washed his hands in innocency." Nor was he convinced of

his mistake "until he went into the sanctuary, and understood their end"—viz. the miseries to which they were destined, as the legitimate fruits of a sinful course. He was then instructed that God had "set them in slippery places, and had cast them down into destruction, and brought them into desolation as in a moment! and utterly consumed them with terrors." All this seems evidently to have taken place, while the wicked were still in the flesh, and while they appeared to the Psalmist to be floating amidst the tide of prosperity and happiness. When God had instructed him what was the real state of these wicked men, concerning which he had been so grossly mistaken, he acknowledges that he had been *foolish and ignorant*, even as a beast before his Creator! Thus it is evident that the Psalmist renounced the supposition of the wicked's being happier than the righteous in this world, as the extravagant illusions of folly and ignorance.

I might here dismiss the *anti-scriptural* sentiment which Mr. F. has laboured to support, having shown that the passages quoted by him for its defence, give it no support, but when viewed in their connexions, effectually explode the hypothesis; were it not for the consideration, that others, though honest in their inquiries after truth, are equally liable from the force of prejudice to fall into the same error: This renders it expedient to lay before the reader the plain declarations of holy writ, as dissuasives from vice on the one hand, and incentives to virtue on the other, by reason of their inevitable consequences in the present mode of existence.

Concerning the present state of the wicked, the language of inspiration gives us the following description. Prov. xii. 15.—"The way of transgressors is hard." Isa. xlviii. 22. "There is no peace saith the Lord unto the wicked." lvii. 20, 21.—"The wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt." Rom. vi. 23. "The wages of sin is death." Here we are furnished with a true and genuine picture of the present condition of the wicked on earth: and it needs no argument to show that it is totally different from the representation which Mr. F. has given.

We may now turn to consult the scriptures as to the present condition of those who are righteous in this world. Psalms xxxvii. 11.—"The meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." lxxxv. 8, 9, 10. "I will hear what God the Lord will speak: for he will speak peace unto his people; and to his saints: but let them not turn again to folly. Surely his salvation is nigh them that fear him; that glory may dwell in our land. Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Cxix. 165. "Great peace have they which love thy law; and nothing shall offend them."—Prov. iii. 17. "Her (that is wisdom's) ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace." We

might add to these, many examples from the New Testament, shewing the superior advantages and blessings attendant on a life of faith and obedience, and the miseries which attend the unbelieving and disobedient, in the present life : but a few must suffice. One of the most severe judgments ever visited upon any people on earth, was that which the great Redeemer denounced against the Jews. It was distinguished by the extraordinary appellation, "great tribulation ; such as was not since the beginning of the world, to *that same time*, no, nor ever shall be." St. Matt. xxiv. 21. The punishment here threatened against the Jews, was executed according to the literal import of the prophesy of Christ, about forty years after the crucifixion of our Lord. This punishment, agreeably to the prediction of Jesus, was brought upon the house of Israel for their disobedience and unbelief. These vials of wrath, in which the days of the most severe vengeance were fulfilled, descended, not upon the believers in the Messiah, but upon those who rejected his doctrine, and despised his authority : while the multitude of his disciples were conducted in safety to a place of refuge till the indignation was past. Which of the above named characters, think ye, enjoyed the greatest portion of happiness in this world ? According to Mr. F. it was the class who were made to drink the very dregs of the cup of trembling ! It is totally unnecessary to offer a single comment upon the inconsistency and extravagance of such a conclusion ; since the good sense of every man must determine the balance of present enjoyment vastly in favor of those who believed the doctrine, and adhered to the precepts of Jesus. Again ; "He that believeth on him, (Christ) is not condemned : but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." St. John, iii. 18. Speaking of the wicked, the apostle asserts, Rom. iii. 16, 17. "Destruction and misery are in their ways : and the way of peace have they not known." The invitation of Christ is equally pertinent. "Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me : for I am meek and lowly in heart ; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." St. Matt. xi. 28-30. The apostle adds to this, the testimony of experience—Heb. iv. 3. "For we which have believed do enter into rest—" and verse 6—"And they to whom it (*the gospel*) was first preached entered not in because of unbelief." In closing these scripture quotations, I must refer the reader to the language of Peter for a description of the happy condition of the believer in the present life. I. Pet. i. 8. "Whom having not seen, ye love ; in whom, though now ye see *him* not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory." Every man who will seriously examine the sentiment which Mr. F. has laboured to maintain, and which stands directly opposed to the scripture testimony here quoted, can scarcely fail to be furnished with the clearest convictions of its incorrectness, and of the pernicious and fatal influence it must produce upon the morals of society, were it generally believed. Only convince mankind that sin would render

them happier in this world than the practice of virtue, and no barriers can be established of sufficient strength to arrest the progress of crime. But convince the rising multitude that sin and misery go hand in hand, and that virtue and pure enjoyment are united by indissoluble bands, and the work of reformation becomes easy and delightful, and the increase of divine knowledge and the spread of pure religion will be proportionably rapid and extensive. Let every friend, therefore, to morality and virtue, take for his motto the language of that truly wise man, Solomon—"The curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked : but he blesseth the habitation of the just." Prov. iii. 33.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A new religious paper is about to be issued at Utica, N. Y. called the "UNIVERSALIST," to be edited by four of our Brethren in the Ministry ; viz. John S. Thompson, Stephen R. Smith, Pitt Morse, and Geo. B. Lisher. The *Rochester Magazine*, *Gospel Inquirer*, and *Herald of Salvation* are to be discontinued.

Proposals have been issued for publishing a religious paper at Troy, N. Y. to be entitled the "EVANGELICAL RESTORATIONIST." The editorial labours are to be conducted by Brs. B. Streeter, and D. Skinner.

We hope the above mentioned publications may be the means of disseminating the glorious truths of the gospel, and accelerate the moral freedom of man.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

ANOTHER PLAN.

MR. EDITOR,

About a year or more since, I read an account of a *Rag Bag Society*, in the State of New-York ; the object of which was to furnish Bags to be hung up behind the doors of places where conference meetings were held ; that those who could give nothing else, might, when they came to meeting, deposit such old rags as they had to spare, in the Bags, which the society would dispose of for cash, and deposit it in the Missionary Box to save the souls of the Heathen. This I conceived would be the *last thing* that could be thought of to draw money from the credulous and unthinking for the pretended purpose of saving souls : But I acknowledge my conceptions were wrong, for yet another plan has been instituted to draw money from the public under pretence of promoting revivals of religion.

A friend of mine has furnished me with the following, taken from a money box, put up in the Tavern of Mr. Pomeroy, in Coventry, Connecticut ; above which, was pasted up the printed Constitution of the Society. ON THE BOX—

"Society for the encouragement of revivals of religion. The contents of this Box shall be faithfully appropriated to the object specified in the 2d article of the above constitution.

"The liberal soul shall be made fat.—And he that watereth, shall be watered also himself." Prov. xi. 25."

The following is the article alluded to on the Box. "Article II. The object of this society shall be to seek out and send forth missionaries, who are qualified by the blessing of God to promote and advance revivals where the state of religion is low, and to lead anxious souls to Christ."

The whole of the constitution would have been written down at the time the above was taken, but time and opportunity would not permit ; nor could my friend obtain a copy. What do they mean in this second article, by "low state of religion ?" can it be any thing else, than where the head is cool, the judgment and understanding clear, the reasoning powers and faculties in full vigour—in fine, where a rational religion is enjoyed ! For myself I think this is what the framers of this society call a low state of religion ; where there are no *whispering* meetings, *anxious* meetings, or *fanaticism* known.—With respect to *real revivals*, or *reformations*, no person can wish for them more than the writer ; but having himself been through many religious excitements in this town, and observed the conduct of those engaged in them, he cannot but be satisfied that much evil and very little good results to community from such excitements. For a number of years I have been satisfied such revivals were the work of men, and time was in this town when such excitements were nearly annually got up : and, sir, it has not been for the want of exertion by our limitarian brethren, that we have had no religious excitement the past winter, and the repose and quietude of families broken and nearly destroyed, as was the case, during the visit of a certain wonderful preacher, so called during days long past, and for the honor of community I trust such scenes will never be acted over again.—"What doth the Lord require of thee, O ! man, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God ?" APOLLOS.

MORNING.

The sullen gloom has fled
Before the rising dawn ;
The Monarch of the day has shed
The op'ning beams of morn.

The shadows all are past,
And rosy day breaks in,
With golden hues o'er ocean cast,
And bids our song begin.

It wakes the melting strains
Of gratitude and praise,
To him who spreads o'er all the plains,
His kind and kindling rays.

We hail in songs of joy,
His mercy and his love,
His grace and truth without alloy,
Descending from above.

His SON in splendour rose,
With beams of heav'nly peace ;
Whose pow'r shall disappoint his foes,
And bid our sorrows cease :

Shall clothe in robes of light,
The sons of Adam's race ;

Dispel the darkness of their night,
And save them by his grace.

When rais'd to joys above,
With all the shining train;
Our theme shall be his boundless love,
Where light and peace remain.

D.

SELECTIONS.

GENERAL SMYTH.

This gentleman, not long since, pledged his honour that he had discovered the true meaning of the *Apocalypse*, or Revelation to St. John. This assurance excited much public curiosity, and rendered great numbers of our citizens anxious to possess themselves of his discoveries. The pamphlet has at length appeared and been examined with care. It appears to merit very little, except the credit of exciting pity for its author, and affording another proof that the authenticity of the Book of Revelation is too well established to be shaken by the feeble attempts of such men as General Smyth.

We had already collected what materials from history we thought necessary for a brief review of the pamphlet in question, but have been happily relieved from the labour of arranging them for the press, by the able refutation contained in the *Universalist Magazine* of last week, over the signature of Marcus.

FROM THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.

Remarks on "An Explanation of the Apocalypse," &c.
By Alexander Smyth, Representative in Congress from Virginia.

MR. SMYTH thinks that the Book of Revelation was not written by the apostle John, but forged, long after his time, by Irenæus, who was Bishop of Lyons in France, from about A. D. 177, to A. D. 202. He supposes that this Book is not "a prophetic vision of future events," but "an artful, enigmatical relation of past events, under the form of prophecy." His hypothesis, in short, is, that Irenæus wrote this book as an enigmatical representation of a series of occurrences which had then lately transpired; and that when he had completed his work, he sent it into the world under the name of John, in the hope that it would be received as the writing of that apostle, and as an old prophecy of the things which he had just described in it.

Mr. Smyth goes on to state what he thinks to be the series of events represented in the book. The 6th chapter of Revelation, he says, relates to the reign and death of the emperor Commodus; the 8th chapter, to the heresies which prevailed during his reign; the 9th chapter, to the same subject; the 11th chapter, to the fall of the emperors, Pertinax and Didius; the 12th chapter, to the emperor Severus, his wife and eldest son, Caracalla; the 13th chapter, to the Roman General, Albinus, to his statues, medals and coins; the 14th chapter, to Caracalla, the army of Severus, and the punishment of the prætorian guards; the 16th chapter to the civil war between the emperor Severus and the usurper, Niger; the 17th chapter, to the city of Byzantium, and to the usurper Niger; the 18th chapter, to the destruction of Byzantium; and the 19th chapter, to

the young emperor, Caracalla, and to the defeat of the rebel, Albinus, at Lyons. (See p. p. 13 and 14 of his pamphlet.)

This is the series of events which Mr. Smyth supposes to be enigmatically represented in the Revelation, and which he consequently supposes to have been already past, when Irenæus wrote the book.

Now, all that is necessary to be done, in order to overthrow this hypothesis, is, to shew that the book of Revelation was in being before the completion of this series of events; for if it existed before, Mr. Smyth himself will doubtless grant that it was not written afterwards; and he will grant too, that if it was written before, it is not an enigmatical history of these occurrences.

Let us, then, first set down the dates of the foregoing series of events; Commodus began his reign, A. D. 180, [Gibbon, vol. i. p. 138,] and was murdered on the last day of the year 192. [Gib. vol. i. p. 156.] Pertinax and Didius were put to death in A. D. 193; [Gib. vol. i. p. p. 165, 185,] and Severus was made emperor in the same year. [Gib. vol. i. p. 181.] Byzantium was taken and destroyed, A. D. 196; and the defeat of Albinus, at Lyons, was in Feb. 197. [Gib. vol. i. p. 188.] So that Mr. Smyth thinks that the Revelation is, in general, an account of the Roman history, from A. D. 180, to A. D. 197; and that the larger part of the book is a representation of what took place after the year 193. Indeed, he seems to suppose, on the 29th page of his pamphlet, that part of the 12th chapter relates to the year 201. In order, therefore, that his hypothesis may possibly be true, it must appear that the Revelation was not composed before A. D. 197, or even 201.

We will now show that this Book was in being, and was read, before this period. 1st. Clemens Alexandrinus, who wrote, according to historians, about A. D. 194, quotes the book of Revelation, and with this remark, "as John says in the Revelation." Does Mr. Smyth suppose that Clemens could have quoted a book, and given it its title, 3, or perhaps 6, years before the book existed? 2d. Irenæus himself manifestly refers to the Revelation in the 3d book of his Work against Heresies; and in the same work, he also calls it by name, "as John in the Revelation says;" though Mr. Smyth observes that Lardner doubts whether this passage be genuine. Now, Irenæus wrote his book against Heresies about A. D. 180, if most historians may be credited; though Tillemont, whose authority is respectable, supposes that he did not finish it, till about A. D. 194. If Irenæus, say at the year 194, either quoted the book of Revelation by its title, or referred to it, this circumstance also will show that the book was written some years previous to the date Mr. Smyth assigns to it. Again: Irenæus wrote *A Work on the Four Evangelists*, which is now lost; but in the fragments of it preserved by Eusebius, the Revelation of John is mentioned by name, and commented on as a book well known. This shews that the Revelation had been some time in circulation, when Irenæus wrote his book on the Evangelists, which must have been before A. D. 202, as it was in that year that Irenæus died.—If the Revelation had been in circulation for

some time before A. D. 202, it could not be an enigmatical history of events which ended in 201.

We will now set down the testimonies which prove that the Revelation was known and read at a still earlier period than the date of the writings of Clemens or Irenæus. Most of these testimonies are mentioned by Mr. Smyth himself, with no other criticism against them, than simply that he disbelieves them; and indeed their united force is such that no other argument but this could avail much against them. 1st. Eusebius says, in his History, that Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, "brought proof from the Revelation of John," in his book against Her-mogenes. Though this book of Theophilus was extant in the time of Eusebius, it has since been lost, and we cannot now determine in what year it was written; but as Theophilus died about A. D. 180, or 185, its date must be placed before that period. This shews that the Revelation was in being, and regarded as authoritative before the year 185. 2d. Eusebius says that Melito, bishop of Sardis (one of the 7 churches addressed in the Revelation) wrote a book entitled, "Concerning the Revelation of St. John." Melito, it is supposed, wrote about A. D. 177; so that at this early period, the Revelation was known and regarded as a book worthy of a treatise upon it, like other books of the Scripture. 3d. Justin Martyr who wrote, not later than the year 160, refers to a passage in Revelation, and at the same time mentions the book by name, "the Revelation made to John, one of the apostles of Christ." This shows that before the year 160, the Revelation was known and considered as the work of St. John.—With regard to this passage in Justin, Mr. Smyth only says, "Justin may have seen some of the Apocalypses from which that which we now have was in part compiled." He admits that it is uncertain whether Justin saw and referred to those former Apocalypses; but he states it as a positive certainty that the Revelation which we now have was in part compiled from them. Now, Mr. Smyth had no authority whatever for stating this: it was his bare conjecture! If his certainties are only conjectures what shall we call his uncertainties? 4th. We have the following historical testimony to prove that the book of Revelation was mentioned by Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, about A. D. 116, whose works are now lost: Andrew, bishop of Cesarea in Capadocia, wrote a Commentary on the Revelation, about A. D. 500, in which he says, "But we judge it needless to enlarge on the divine inspiration of this book [Revelation] to which so many blessed men bear a credible testimony: as Gregory the divine, and Cyril, and others more ancient than they, I mean Papias, Irenæus, Methodius, and Hippolytus." This shews that the Revelation was known to Papias about A. D. 116; which was only twenty years after it is generally supposed to have been written by St. John, and more than eighty years before Mr. Smyth thinks it was forged by Irenæus!

The foregoing ancient testimonies concerning this book are all collected by Lardner, from whom we have extracted them. They certainly prove, if historical documents can prove any thing, the incorrectness of Mr. Smyth's hypothesis. But setting all

these aside, the very way in which he attempts to reconcile the figurative representations of the Apocalypse to that train of events to which he applies them, is, to us, satisfactory evidence that he is altogether in a mistake. Men are apt to regard their own hypotheses, especially if brought forth with hard labor and much pain, with all the tender but jealous affection which mothers feel for their children; and Mr. Smyth will perhaps hardly forgive us for saying that some of the interpretations to which he is compelled, in order to carry on his mode of applying the Revelation, are the most far-fetched and visionary that we ever heard from a man of sound mind. For instance: he suggests that this expression in the xi. chap. "And a tenth part of the city fell," meant only that the emperor Pertinax was killed; because that in his name there are the two Roman numerals, I & X, i. e. one, ten. See p. 25 of his pamphlet. The expression, "And in the earthquake were slain names of men seven thousand," he thinks means only that Didius was slain; it must mean Didius, because that in his name we find the Roman numerals, VII & D D, i. e. seven, a thousand! See p. 26 of his pamphlet.

Though it is not absolutely necessary, it may be of some use to examine the circumstances adduced by Mr. Smyth to shew that the Revelation was not written by St. John. 1st. He says, "It is admitted by Epiphanius and Grotius that there was no christian church at Thyatira, in the time of St. John." Now, as there is an epistle to the church at Thyatira, in the second chapter of Revelation, this fact would seem to militate against the genuineness of the book. But as it regards Epiphanius, the case is as follows: He was contending with the Alogi, heretics who, to make out that St. John did not write the Revelation, affirmed that there was no church at Thyatira in his time. Epiphanius, thinking that this assertion of theirs did not invalidate the authenticity of the book, admitted it, and then proceeded to shew them, as he thought, that it presented no real objection against St. John's being the writer of the Revelation.* Now every one knows that it is not uncommon with controvertists, when they think the objections of their opponents do not affect the point in debate, to admit those objections, not because they think them true, but because that, true or false, they have nothing to do with the argument. This admission of Epiphanius, therefore, under such circumstances, does not prove that he believed there was no church at Thyatira in the time of St. John; and it is consequently nothing to Mr. Smyth's purpose. That there actually were christians at Thyatira, even in St. Paul's time, is very probable from several passages in Acts. 2d. Mr. Smyth says that the Revelation "condemns the Nicolaitans; and Nicolaus the founder of that sect, was of the second century." There was, indeed, a Nicolaus who founded a sect of this name in the second century; but there also existed, before him, another and very different sect of the same name, founded by one Nicholas of Antioch in the first century. [See Mosheim's Hist. and Buck's Dict.] 3d. Mr. Smyth adduces the case of Polycarp, of whose writings nothing now remains except

* See Newton's Diss. on the Proph.

his epistle written to the Philippians about A. D. 108, or 116. Of him Mr. Smyth says, "he never mentions the Révelation. He wrote on the resurrection, and the last judgment; and he uses this expression, 'Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?'" If Polycarp had known such a book as *The Revelation* of St. John the divine, and considered it as the work of John the apostle, he would, most assuredly, have quoted it in writing on such subjects." Such is Mr. Smyth's statement and argument. But the true statement is thus: Polycarp does not, properly speaking, "write on the resurrection, and the last judgment;" in the whole of his epistle he merely *speaks of* the resurrection in *three* different sentences only; and of a future judgment in only *four* sentences; and what he thus says of either subject, is accidental. It is certainly no wonder that he did not quote the Revelation; he did not even refer to any part of that labored account of the resurrection in I. Cor. xv. 4th, Mr. Smyth says that Athenagoras of Alexandria, who, about A. D. 177 or 180, "wrote a discourse on the resurrection of the dead, never quotes or refers to the Apocalypse; a strong presumptive proof that no such work was known to him." Now, let the object and character of this discourse of Athenagoras be understood, and every reader, even Mr. Smyth himself, will instantly see that his not quoting or referring to the Revelation, is no indication that the book was unknown to him. The purpose for which Athenagoras wrote this discourse, was to remove the objections which *heathen* philosophers urged against the doctrine of the resurrection; and to shew them that the doctrine was not only reasonable, but absolutely necessary even on the ground of *natural* religion.—Writing for such men, it would have been useless for him to bring testimony from the *scriptures* which they contemptuously rejected. We do not remember that in all his discourse he has brought one text from any part of the Bible to prove his doctrine; though in a very few instances he has expressed himself in scripture language; and in, perhaps, three or four cases, he appears to have selected texts, in which to *state*, not prove or defend, his meaning. 5th. Mr. Smyth adduces the two following cases: "Caius, a presbyter of Rome, from A. D. 210 to 217, as we are told by Eusebius, writes thus; 'And Cerinthus also, (who by his revelations, as if written by some great apostle, imposes upon us monstrous relations of things of his own invention, as shown to him by an angel,) says that, after the resurrection, there shall be a terrestrial kingdom of Christ, and that men shall live again in Jerusalem, subject to sensual desires and pleasure;—and he says there will be a thousand years spent in nuptial entertainments.' This shows that Caius had read the book of the Revelation, and considered it a forgery by Cerinthus." Again: "Dionysius of Alexandria, from A. D. 230 to 265, has criticised the Apocalypse. He contends that the manner, style, structure, sentiments, diction, and construction, plainly distinguish this work from the writings of the apostle John." These two cases of Caius and Dionysius are probably stated correctly by Mr. Smyth; for it seems probable that Caius alluded to our book of Revelation, though Lardner doubts it.

But still it ought to be observed that these two cases are very unfavorable to Mr. Smyth's hypothesis; for Caius, so far from thinking the book a *late* forgery, attributed it to *Cerinthus*, who lived in the time of the apostles; and Dionysius did not doubt but that it was as old as the time of St. John, though he believed that it was not written by him. They disagreed with the generality of the fathers, not about the *date* of the book, but about its *author*; and of this particular point, it does not seem that they were any better qualified to judge, than we are at the present day, for they adduce no historical evidence.

Let us now set down the early historical evidence which we find either for or against the antiquity and genuineness of the Revelation: Papias mentioned it about A. D. 116, if we may believe Andrew; Justin certainly referred to it before A. D. 160, and called it "The revelation made to John, one of the apostles of Christ;" Melito wrote a book upon it, about A. D. 177, entitled "Concerning the Revelation of St. John," if we may credit Eusebius; Theophilus adduced it as proof, before the year 180, if Eusebius may be believed; both Irenæus and Clemens Alexandrinus certainly quote it, about A. D. 194, and call it St. John's; Caius, after A. D. 210, and Dionysius, after the year 230, both suppose it was written in St. John's time, though neither of them think that St. John was the author.

After all this, it is surely a vain attempt to make us believe that the book did not exist till after the year 200.

It has been said that Mr. Smyth's pamphlet evinces deep research in ancient history. This is wholly a mistake. We know not but that Mr. Smyth is thoroughly versed in history; but his pamphlet exhibits no traces of an investigation which any gentleman of general reading might not go through with, in less than a month, if he had access to a large library.

MARCUS.

We have received a communication, signed "Orion," which contains *twenty-one* topics. We presume that he will expect a reply to each of these topics, whenever his communication is inserted.—As this course would necessarily exclude too great a portion of other important matter, to make room for objections and replies, which, in substance, have for a long time been familiar to the publick, we must omit its insertion, at least for the present.

The continuation of our reply to "An Inquirer" is necessarily omitted this week by the press of other matter.

MARRIED,

In this town, on Sunday evening last, by Rev. Mr. Wilson, Mr. Orestus Whitney, of Westborough, to Miss Abby Potter, of this town.

In Johnston, on Sunday last, by Rev. Mr. Sprague, Mr. Newman Thurber, of Rehoboth, to Mrs. Ardelia Bly, of this town.

DIED,

In this town, on the 11th inst. Maj. Elijah Williams, in his 81st year.

On the same day, Mr. Isaac Hathaway, in his 21st year.

Mr. Benjamin Tabor, in his 70th year.

In Foster, on the 27th ult. Mrs. Martha Fuller, relict of Mr. Jonathan Fuller, in the 88th year of her age. At Pawtucket, on the 28th ult. Mrs. Lois Jenks, wife of Mr. Moses Jenks, in the 83d year of her age: Both daughters of the late Mr. Samuel Tingley, of Attleborough.—They have now living two sisters between the ages of 60 and 70, three sisters and one brother between the ages of 70 and 80, and two sisters and one brother between the ages of 80 and 90.

In Savannah, on the 26th ult. John Young, youngest son of Mr. John Young, of this town, in the 17th year of his age.